

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 10 are pending in the application. Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims define patentable subject matter.

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the Examiner asserts that “multimedia data stream” lacks an antecedent basis. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended the claims to improve clarity. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to remove the § 112, second paragraph, rejection.

Claims 1-2, 4-6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker (U.S. Patent No. 5,961,645) in view of McClain et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,772,214; hereafter “McClain”). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of Logan (U.S. Patent No. 5,721,827). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of Microsoft Press (Computer Dictionary, 3rd edition, 1997, ISBN: 157231446X). Applicant traverses the prior art rejections.

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 10 to recite “analyzing a signature included in said multimedia data stream for the purpose of said filtering.”

The claimed feature of analyzing the signature (accompanying the data) for the purpose of filtering is advantageous when used for a private network, e.g., inside companies. Signatures contain information about the transferred content, e.g., there is a copyright, it is paid-up service, the exact origin of the content. Such filtering allows not only to restrict access but also allows access to the user and also to the private network. For example, in a company, if the user asks

for a paid-up service, the filtering device will be informed by the signature and then the access will be refused. Similarly, when downloading music, it will prevent the company from receiving the bill thereafter.

Although such signatures are known in the art, none of the cited references describe or suggest the possibility of filtering via the signature. Further, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to modify the cited references to filter via a signature. Current solutions are based on filtering the site address or some wording inside the data stream. Nothing suggests analyzing the data accompanying the data stream or filtering at the level of the private access node, by an analysis of the data, i.e., comprising the signature.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 10, as well as dependent claims 2, 4-7 and 9, should be allowable because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Application No. 09/873,357

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher R. Lipp
Registration No. 41,157

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 11, 2005

Attorney Docket No.: Q64734